



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| | | | | |
|---|-------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 10/681,017 | 10/08/2003 | Andrey Lelikov | MSFT-2781/305438.1 | 6227 |
| 41505 | 7590 | 10/05/2009 | EXAMINER | |
| WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) | | | PARTHASARATHY, PRAMILA | |
| CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| 2929 ARCH STREET | | | 2436 | |
| PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891 | | | MAIL DATE | |
| | | | 10/05/2009 | |
| | | | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/681,017 | LELIKOV ET AL. |
| | Examiner PRAMILA PARTHASARATHY | Art Unit 2436 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 June 2009.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 24-36 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the communication 06/17/2009. Claims 1 – 36 are currently pending. Claims 1 – 23 were cancelled. Claims 24 – 36 have been examined.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, in view of amendments to the claims, have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the 35 USC 101 rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of obviousness-type double patenting rejection. Additionally, Examiner concurs with the (previous) Examiner Okoronkwo with respect to indicated allowable subject matter along with the reasons for allowance and directs the Applicant's attention to item #4 of this office action.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 24 – 36 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over

Art Unit: 2436

- a. claims 1 – 7 and 18 – 28 of copending application 11/114,509,
- b. claims 1 – 6 and 17 – 23 of copending application 11/139,947,
- c. claims 11 – 20 of copending application 11/273,775,
- d. claims 1 – 22 of Patent 7,379,918.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because

- "A computer system comprising: a processing unit; and a memory; the processing unit executing first code defining a first process operating on the computer, the first code executing on the processing unit implementing at least one triggering device; the memory holding a digital license corresponding to the first process, the license setting forth terms and conditions for operating the first process; and the processing unit executing second code defining a second process operating on the computer for proxy-executing code corresponding to each triggering device of the first process on behalf of such first process, the second process including a license evaluator for evaluating the license to determine whether the first process is to be operated in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth in such license, the second process choosing whether to in fact proxy-execute the code corresponding to each triggering device of the first process on behalf of such first process based at least in part on whether the license evaluator has determined that the first process is to be operated in accordance with the terms and conditions of the license, whereby the first process is dependent upon the second process for operation thereof" (claim 24, instant application) is analogous to or an obvious variation of:

The claims of the copending applications and of the patent contain every element of claims 24 – 36 of the instant application and thus anticipate the claims of the instant application. Claims 24 – 36 of the instant application therefore are not patentably distinct from the copending application claims and as such are unpatentable for obvious-type double patenting. A later patent/application claim is not patentably distinct from an earlier claim if the later claim is anticipated by the earlier claim. Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Claims of the instant application are anticipated by patent claims in that the patent claims contains all the limitations of the instant application. Claims of the instant application therefore is not patentably distinct from the earlier patent claims and as such are unpatentable for obvious-type double patenting (*In re Goodman* (CAFC) 29 USPQ2d 2010 (12/3/1993).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 24 – 36 are allowed over prior art.

Examiner requests filing the Terminal Disclaimer to overcome the obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Please make a note of change in Examiner with this application.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PRAMILA PARTHASARATHY whose telephone number is (571)272-3866. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00a.m. to 5:00p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Pramila Parthasarathy/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2436